

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed March 10, 2006, restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. § 121:

- I. Claims 72-78, drawn to a process, classified in class 423, subclass 447.3.
- II. Claims 79-85, drawn to a product, classified in class 423, subclass 447.2.

Applicants provisionally elect, with traverse, the Group I claims, namely 72-78, drawn to a process, for prosecution on the merits.

It is respectfully requested that the restriction requirement be favorably reconsidered and withdrawn. In view of the fact that the present claims are all related to the same subject matter, it is submitted that a search of the prior art when examining the elected claims of Group I would, at the same time, result in a search of the prior art when examining the remaining claim of Group II. It would seem, then, that to require the filing of another separate divisional application directed to the Group II claim would result in the very same search being repeated, but at a later date. It is submitted that this duplicate search would be quite inefficient to the operation of the Patent and Trademark Office.

Therefore, since a single search can be performed for all Groups of claims without any significant burden on the Patent Office, it is respectfully requested that the restriction requirement be withdrawn.

At the very minimum, Applicants respectfully reserve the right to request a rejoinder of the Group II claims 79-85 if and when the Group I claims 72-78 are found allowable.

Applicants respectfully submit that its pending claims are in condition for allowance.

If there are any additional fees, please credit any overpayment or charge any deficiencies to our firm deposit Account No. 50-0540.

Dated: April 7, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Albert B. Chen/
Albert B. Chen, Reg. No. 41,667
Barry Evans, Reg. No. 22,802
Kramer Levin Naftalis & Frankel LLP
1177 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10036
(212) 715-9100